

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
BEAUMONT DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

CHARLES EDWARD ADAMS

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CASE NUMBER 1:23-CR-00067-MAC

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION ON PETITION FOR WARRANT
FOR OFFENDER UNDER SUPERVISION**

Pending is a “Petition for Warrant or Summons for Offender Under Supervision” filed August 30, 2024, alleging that the Defendant, Charles Edward Adams, violated his conditions of supervised release. This matter is referred to the Honorable Christine L. Stetson, United States Magistrate Judge, for review, hearing, and submission of a report with recommended findings of fact and conclusions of law. *See United States v. Rodriguez*, 23 F.3d 919, 920 n.1 (5th Cir. 1994); *see also* 18 U.S.C. § 3401(i) (2000); E.D. TEX. CRIM. R. CR-59.

I. The Original Conviction and Sentence

Charles Edward Adams was sentenced on October 2, 2019, before The Honorable John D. Rainey, of the Southern District of Texas, after pleading guilty to the offense of Conspiracy to Possess with Intent to Distribute more than 50 grams of a Mixture or Substance Containing Methamphetamine, a Class A felony. This offense carried a statutory maximum imprisonment term of Life. The guideline imprisonment range, based on a total offense level of 29 and a criminal history category of VI, was 151 to 188 months. Charles Edward Adams was subsequently sentenced below the guideline range to 87 months’ imprisonment followed by a 3 year term of supervised release subject to the standard conditions of release, plus special conditions to include

treatment and testing for substance abuse, restrictions on controlled and psychoactive substances, 180 days in community confinement at a time determined by probation, and a \$100 special assessment.

II. The Period of Supervision

On September 2, 2022, Charles Edward Adams completed his period of imprisonment and began service of the supervision term. On July 6, 2023, jurisdiction in this case was transferred to the Eastern District of Texas and the case was reassigned to U.S. District Judge Marcia A. Crone.

III. The Petition

United States Probation filed the Petition for Warrant for Offender Under Supervision raising four allegations. The petition alleges that Charles Edward Adams violated the following conditions of release:

Allegation 1. The Defendant shall not commit another federal, state, or local crime.

Allegation 2. The Defendant must refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance.

Allegation 3. The Defendant must not knowingly leave the federal judicial district where you are authorized to reside without first getting permission from the court or the probation officer.

Allegation 4. If the Defendant is arrested or questioned by a law enforcement officer, you must notify the probation officer within 72 hours.

IV. Proceedings

On January 14, 2025, the undersigned convened a hearing pursuant to Rule 32.1 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure to hear evidence and arguments on whether the Defendant violated conditions of supervised release, and the appropriate course of action for any such violations.

At the revocation hearing, counsel for the Government and the Defendant announced an agreement as to a recommended disposition regarding the revocation. The Defendant agreed to plead “true” to the first allegation that claimed he failed to refrain from committing another crime. In return, the parties agreed that he should serve a term of 21 months’ imprisonment with 18 months of supervised release to follow.

V. Principles of Analysis

According to Title 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(3), the court may revoke a term of supervised release and require the defendant to serve in prison all or part of the term of supervised release authorized by statute for the offense that resulted in such term of supervised release without credit for time previously served on post-release supervision, if the court, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure applicable to revocation of probation or supervised release, finds by a preponderance of the evidence that the defendant violated a condition of supervised release, except that a defendant whose term is revoked under this paragraph may not be required to serve on any such revocation more than five years in prison if the offense that resulted in the term of supervised release is a Class A felony, more than three years if such offense is a Class B felony, more than two years in prison if such offense is a Class C or D felony, or more than one year in any other case. The original offense of conviction was a Class A felony, therefore, the maximum imprisonment sentence is 5 years.

According to U.S.S.G. § 7B1.1(a)¹, if the court finds by a preponderance of the evidence that the Defendant violated conditions of supervision by failing to refrain from committing another crime, the Defendant will be guilty of committing a Grade B violation. U.S.S.G. § 7B1.3(a)

1. All of the policy statements in Chapter 7 that govern sentences imposed upon revocation of supervised release are non-binding. See U.S.S.G. Ch. 7 Pt. A; *United States v. Bradberry*, 360 F. App’x. 508, 509 (5th Cir. 2009).

indicates that upon a finding of a Grade A or B violation, the court shall revoke probation or supervised release, or upon the finding of a Grade C violation, the court may (A) revoke probation or supervised release; or (B) extend the term of probation or supervised release and/or modify the conditions of supervision.

U.S.S.G. § 7B1.4(a) provides that in the case of revocation of supervised release based on a Grade B violation and a criminal history category of VI, the policy statement imprisonment range is 21 to 27 months.

According to U.S.S.G. § 7B1.3(f) any term of imprisonment imposed upon revocation of probation or supervised release shall be ordered to be served consecutively to any sentence of imprisonment that the defendant is serving, whether or not the sentence of imprisonment being served resulted from the conduct that is the basis of the revocation of probation or supervised release. The Defendant's agreed upon revocation sentence shall run consecutively to the imprisonment term he is serving in case number CR-2023-000651 from the 36th Judicial District Court in the State of Louisiana.

According to 18 U.S.C. § 3583(h), when a term of supervised release is revoked and the defendant is required to serve a term of imprisonment, the court may include a requirement that the defendant be placed on a term of supervised release after imprisonment. The length of such a term of supervised release shall not exceed the term of supervised release authorized by statute for the offense that resulted in the original term of supervised release, less any term of imprisonment that was imposed upon revocation of supervised release. The authorized term of supervised release for this offense is not more than Life.

U.S.S.G. § 7B1.3(g)(2) indicates where supervised release is revoked and the term of imprisonment imposed is less than the maximum term of imprisonment imposable upon

revocation, the court may include a requirement that the defendant be placed on a term of supervised release upon release from imprisonment. The length of such a term of supervised release shall not exceed the term of supervised release authorized by statute for the offense that resulted in the original term of supervised release, less any term of imprisonment that was imposed upon revocation of supervised release.

In determining the Defendant's sentence, the court shall consider:

1. The nature and circumstance of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant; *see* 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(1);
2. The need for the sentence imposed: to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct; to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant; and to provide the Defendant with needed educational or vocational training, medical care, other corrective treatment in the most effective manner; *see* 18 U.S.C. §§ 3553 (a)(2)(B)-(D);
3. Applicable guidelines and policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission, for the appropriate application of the provisions when modifying or revoking supervised release pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 994(a)(3), that are in effect on the date the defendant is sentenced; *see* 18 U.S.C. 3553(a)(4); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 924(A)(3);
4. Any pertinent policy statement issued by the Sentencing Commission, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 994(a)(2), that is in effect on the date the defendant is sentenced; *see* 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(5); and
5. The need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities among defendants with similar records who have been found guilty of similar conduct; *see* 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(6).
6. The need to provide restitution to any victims of the offense.

18 U.S.C. §§ 3583(e) and 3553(a).

VI. Application

The Defendant pled "true" to the petition's allegation that he violated a mandatory condition of release that he failed to refrain from committing another crime. Based upon the Defendant's plea of "true" to this allegation of the Petition for Warrant or Summons for Offender Under Supervision and U.S.S.G. § 7B1.1(a), the undersigned finds that the Defendant violated a condition of supervised release.

The undersigned has carefully considered each of the factors listed in 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e). The Defendant's violation is a Grade B violation, and the criminal history category is VI. The policy statement range in the Guidelines Manual is 21 to 27 months. The Defendant did not comply with the conditions of supervision and has demonstrated an unwillingness to adhere to conditions of supervision.

Consequently, incarceration appropriately addresses the Defendant's violation. The sentencing objectives of punishment, deterrence and rehabilitation along with the aforementioned statutory sentencing factors will best be served by a prison sentence of 21 months with 18 months of supervised release to follow.

VII. Recommendations

The court should find that the Defendant violated the allegation in the petition that he violated a mandatory condition of release by failing to refrain from committing another crime. The petition should be granted, and the Defendant's supervised release should be revoked pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3583. The Defendant should be sentenced to a term of 21 months' imprisonment with 18 months of supervised release to follow. The Defendant requested to serve his prison term at the Federal Correctional Institution in Butner, North Carolina. The Defendant's request should be accommodated, if possible.

As stated at the final revocation hearing, without objection, the same mandatory, standard and special conditions of supervised release previously imposed when the Defendant was originally sentenced in this case shall be re-imposed. Such conditions are set forth in the Judgment, and the rationale for these conditions is contained in the Defendant's Presentence Investigation Report.

VIII. Objections

At the close of the revocation hearing, the Defendant, defense counsel, and counsel for the government each signed a standard form waiving their right to object to the proposed findings and recommendations contained in this report, consenting to revocation of supervised release, and consenting to the imposition of the above sentence recommended in this report (involving all conditions of supervised release, if applicable). The Defendant also waived his right to be present and speak and have his counsel present and speak before the district court imposes the recommended sentence. Therefore, the court may act on this report and recommendation immediately.

SIGNED this the 14th day of January, 2025.



Christine L Stetson
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE